

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
(SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)

International file number      PCT/EP2005/050079

---

**Re Point V**

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

**1      Related Art Documents**

In the present opinion reference is made to the following documents:

D1:    S-A 5,420,790 (RAVAS, J. R. ET AL.) May 30, 1995 (1995-05-30)

D2:    US-A 5,459,449 (RAVAS, J. R. ET AL.) October 17, 1995 (1995-10-17)

D3:    DE 100 57 917 A1 (ROBERT BOSCH GMBH) May 29, 2002 (2002-05-29)

D4:    DE 39 21 305 A1 (ROBERT BOSCH GMBH, 7000 STUTTGART, GERMANY) January 10, 1991 (1991-01-10)

D5:    BELAU, H.: "ZUENDKONDENSATOR ENTLADESCHALTUNG FUER AIRBAGSYSTEME [IGNITION CAPACITOR DISCHARGE CIRCUIT FOR AIRBAG SYSTEMS]" SIEMENS TECHNIK REPORT [SIEMENS TECHNOLOGY REPORT], SIEMENS AG, ERLANGEN, GERMANY, vol. 3, no. 8, July 2000 (2000-07), page 17, XP000936317 ISSN: 1436-7777

**2      Claims 1 through 6**

2.1    The present patent application does not meet the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT because the object of

Claim 1 is not novel as defined by Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses refer to this document; see Figure 1) a device for supplying an ignition current from an energy reserve (30, 32) to at least one ignition power module (8), a voltage regulator (20) being connected between the energy reserve (30, 32) and the at least one ignition power module (8) such that the voltage regulator (29) sets a voltage on the at least one ignition power module at a predetermined level (column 3, line 44 through column 4, line 30).

The features of independent Claim 1 are disclosed by document D1, so the object of Claim 1 is not novel.

2.2 Dependent Claims 2 through 6 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, fulfill the PCT requirements with regard to novelty (Article 33(2) PCT) and/or inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT). The reasons for this are as follows:

The features of dependent Claims 2 and 6 are known from document D1 (see Figure 1).

The features of the dependent Claims 3 through 5 have already been used for the same purpose in a similar device (see document D2, column 1, line 64 through column 2, line 25). It was therefore obvious to those skilled in the art to apply these features to a device according to document D1 with a corresponding effect and thus to arrive at a device according to Claims 3 through 5.

Consequently, the object of Claims 2 and 6 is not novel

and the object of Claims 3 through 5 is not based on an inventive step.

### **3. Industrial Applicability**

The object of Claims 1 through 6 appears to meet the requirements of Article 33(4) PCT because it seems to be manufacturable, i.e., implementable and also usable at least in the field of automotive engineering.